

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/092,591		03/08/2002	Shinji Yamamori	Q68895	1085	
23373	7590	12/22/2005		EXAMINER		
SUGHRU		•	COLE, MONIQUE T			
SUITE 800		NIA AVENUE, 1	N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	TON, D	C 20037		1743		

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·····	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	,,,
		10/092,591	YAMAMORI ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	 .
		Monique T. Cole	1743	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI y statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	06 October 2005.		
		This action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merit	ts is
	closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wind Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 and 13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 11, 12, 14-17 is/are objected to Claim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to by t	the Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152	2.
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	:
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	. 4) 🗍 Interview :	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	48) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ r No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08) 5) Notice of 1 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/092,591

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-9 are rendered indefinite because it is unclear whether the support member is affirmatively recited in the claim. The claim recites, "when the support member is attached to an area located below the nostrils of the living body." It is unclear from this statement whether the support member is an actual structural limitation or hypothetical component that may or may not be present. Further clarification and/or correction is required.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 2, 10 & 13 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-19 of copending

Page 2

Art Unit: 1743

Application No. 10/779,852. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications contain a support member (airway adapter), light-emitting element (photo emitter), light-receiving element (photo receiver), and a particular respiratory flow path to be facially arranged below the nostrils. The scope of the sensor claims in the instant application is broader than that of 10/779,852.

3. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 10/6/2005, with respect to the EP '269 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been withdrawn.
- 4. Claims 11, 12, 14-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique T. Cole whose telephone number is 571-272-1255. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday & Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/092,591 Page 4

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monique T. Cole Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

mtc